

REMARKS
ON A
LETTER
TO
Dr. *WATERLAND*,
In RELATION to the
Natural Account
OF
LANGUAGES.

THE THIRD EDITION.

BY
PHILOBIBLICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

L O N D O N:

Printed for S. BIRT, at the Bible and Ball
in *Ave-Mary-Lane*. MDCCLXII.

REMARKS

ON THE

LANGUAGE



OF

THE

THE THIRD EDITION.

BY

LONDON:

Printed for S. BART, at the Bible and Ball
in New-Bury-Lane, MDCCLXII.

P R E F A C E

THE following Pages being drawn up occasionally, in Opposition to a few general Paragraphs only in a small Pamphlet, the Author did not think himself concern'd to enter farther into the Subject of Languages for that Time, than the present Occasion might seem to require; and for that Reason contented himself with correcting the defective and fallacious Accounts, which had been given of the Sentiments of the Learned upon the Point, and with dropping a few short Hints upon the main Question, as Principles or the Ground-work to a larger Treatise, if any deeper Prosecution of the Point had been render'd necessary.

But no Reply being offer'd to this Tract on the other Side, tho' strongly and often urg'd to it by several ingenious Writers, the little Piece was left to the Reader in its first Draught without any subsequent Illustration or Enlargement. And 'tis presumed, from the favourable Reception it has met with already, that though the Sentiments it espouses on the ancient Diversity of Tongues, are not here re-
pre-

presented in their full Strength, and with the utmost Accuracy, nor defended particularly against some Exceptions and Authorities; yet even in their present Form they appear not destitute of Weight and Use, and will, I hope, be deem'd very capable of greater Lights and Supports, inasmuch as the most celebrated Names in the Republick of Letters, such as Scaliger and Bochart, have not scrupled to patronise the same Hypothesis.

In the mean Time the Reader is desired to observe one farther Circumstance of these Remarks, that they were written when the Letter to Dr. W. was generally attributed to a Person many Degrees inferior in Abilities and Character to the real Author of it, and when the latter was not so much as suspected by the Remarker of such a Design. To this Mistake was owing in a great Measure the Tartness of the following Expostulations, so expressive of Disdain and Indignation in the Author; which, how suitable soever towards the Adversary first supposed, would on several Accounts have been mollified considerably with regard to the other, if known at that Time, notwithstanding any Provocations from his memorable Abuses of Divines.

TO

T O

The AUTHOR.

SIR,

IN a late Letter of yours to the Reverend and learned Dr. *Waterland* I meet with the following Passage pag. 38, 39. *As to the Story itself* (i. e. of Babel, and the confusion of Languages) *one must needs own it to be a strange one* — 'Tis certain it has never made any great impression on Men of Letters, however pious otherwise and religious: who in tracing the origin and antiquity of the several Languages, seldom think it necessary to run back to Babel, but find the cause to be grounded in Reason and Nature; in the necessary mutability of human things; the rise and fall of States and Empires; change of Modes and Customs; which necessarily introduce a proportionable change in Language. 'Tis from these principles, that Men of Learning have in fact demonstrated the Causes, and deduc'd the History of most particular Languages from their source and origin; not only of those which now obtain, but of such also, as tho' once flourishing are

A now

now no longer in common use and practice: as the Greek, Latin, Italian, French &c.

MANY *both of the Antients and Moderns have endeavour'd to prove, that the Hebrew was the first and common Language of all, till in process of time, thro' the influence of the causes above hinted, all other Languages sprang out of it, as naturally, as many Shoots from the same Root, many Branches from the same Stock.*

THESE words, as they lie in the form of a general Hypothesis, I chuse to be the subject of a few Pages, without interposing in the particular Argument and Dispute between you and your Adversary, or presuming to appear professedly in Defence of a Person, who, I doubt not, will prove himself perfectly qualified to vindicate the Honour and Authority of Scripture, as well as his own Reputation.

WHEN I first read the Passage above cited in your Letter, I could not but discern immediately the artful design and view of it, 1st. To give us a hint of your own great advancement and depth in Literature; 2^{dly}, To cast a tacit and distant Reflection on Divines, for their supposed simplicity, and unacquaintance with the *Nature and Original of Languages*. 3^{dly}. To suggest and insinuate, that *all Men of Letters* and understanding, who have trac'd the *Origin and Antiquity of Lan-*

Languages, have shewn no regard to the Scripture-History of the Babel-confusion, but proceeded wholly upon *Reason* and *Nature* in their Critical Enquiries and Deductions about them.

THIS last Article being express'd with an extraordinary air of assurance, and in terms very full, bold, and didactical, is to me, I confess, matter of surprize and amazement; tho' not of much trouble and uneasiness. I have made it often the business and diversion of some Hours to search a little into the *Origin* and *Antiquity of Languages*, and have accordingly consulted, as far as I have been able, the Criticks of best note and character upon that subject; but I really do not observe, that the Scripture-Story of Babel *made never any great impression on Men of Letters*, but quite the reverse, as shall be shewn by and by. Strange this! that you and I should see, think, and conclude so differently upon the same Men and Things! But to tell you the truth, I am fully perswaded, that you have not examin'd so far into these matters, as the nature of the thing and such positive assertions might require: and I flatter myself with hopes of proving it clearly to you, and your Readers, before I have done. You have evidently touch'd but slightly on the learned discoveries of modern Criticks, and, not considering with a proper

A 2

attention

attention either the end or use of them, have unhappily fallen into such a mistake, as would mortify a Scholar to be published by any one, much more by himself.

You tell me that *this Story* of Babel has never made any great impresson on *Men of Letters* who have trac'd the Origin and Antiquity of Languages. This I must affirm to have not the least Ground, Reason, or Colour of Reason. Fact and Experience are as strong against you, as they can be against any Paradox or Hallucination whatever. Many Writers have collected with great care and curiosity the opinions and judgments of the Learned on the Babel-confusion of Tongues: the chief of which are *Buxtorf* (a), *Pererius* (b), *Duret* (c), *Bp. Walton* (d), and *Morin* (e): not one of all these mention any single Christian Author that ever disputed the Authority of the Sacred Text, but only recount the many and different Interpretations of it. This is evidence alone beyond all exception, that *Men of Letters* who had trac'd the Origin of Languages, had receiv'd no small impresson from the Scripture Story of Babel. But perhaps you would wish to hear more exprefs and particular Declara-

(a) Buxtorfius Fil. Dissertat. Philolog 2. (b) Pererius Lib. 16. in Genesin. (c) L'Histoire des Langues, Cap. 2, 3. (d) Walton. Proleg. in Polyglot. 1. (e) Stephanus Morin. Exercit. de Ling. Prim. ejusque Appendic. Part. 1. Cap. 8.

tions against you. Take this from *Buntorf*.

(f) *Philosophers and some others, unacquainted with History and Scripture, have attributed this variety (of Languages) to Nature. —*

Divines, following the Authority of Moses, refer the Origin of the multitude of Languages to God, and make him the Author of it: For thus he (Moses) writes of this matter Genes. 11. v. 6, 7, 8, 9. The Lord said &c. And in this most are agreed. But as to the manner and form of the Confusion how it was effected they are divided in their opinions.

So Bp. *Walton*, another judicious Critick in this part of Learning. (g) *I must now in*

(f) *Philosophi & alii nonnulli, Historiæ & rerum Sacrarum imperiti, Naturæ hanc varietatem adscripsere. — Theologi, Auctoritatem Moysi secuti, ad Deum optimum Max. multitudinis linguarum originem referunt, Illumque ejus Authorem faciunt. Sic enim ille hæc de re scribit Genes. 11. v. 6, 7, 8, 9. Dixit Dominus &c. Quibus verbis disertè Deo hujus rei causa adscribitur. Et in hoc quidem consentiunt & conveniunt plerique. Attamen in modo efficiendi, & formâ hujus confusionis describendâ, variant sententiis.*

(g) *Proleg. 1. §. 7. Confusio linguarum quo Authore, & quomodo facta sit, proximo loco inquirendum. Ab ipsis hominibus fuisse nemo facile crediderit. — Solus Creator qui unitatem linguæ primus dedit, eam mutare & tollere potest. — Restat itaque Confusionem a solo Deo inductam fuisse. Sic enim disertè docet textus. Gen. 11. 9. Dominus confudit labia eorum: cumque subito & quasi momento facta sit hæc unius linguæ in plures divisio, & varietas tanta in animis hominum introducta sit, proficisci aliunde non poterat — quàm ab eo cui velle & facere idem est: quique donum linguarum (miraculorum omnium ferè maximum) hominibus etiam indoctis immediatè contulit, hæc mutationem Babylo- nicam virtute planè divinâ effecit.*

the

the next place enquire by whom and in what manner the confusion of Tongues happen'd. That it was owing to any human means no body would easily be persuaded. The Creator alone, who at first gave the unity of Language, can change and destroy it. It remains therefore that the Confusion was introduced by God alone. For thus the Text expressly teaches us Gen. 11. 9. The Lord confounded their Language. And as this division of one Language into many was effected on a sudden and as it were instantaneously, and so great a variety infused into the minds of Men, it could not proceed from any other cause, but Him with whom to will and to do are the same; and He that conferred, by immediate inspiration, upon Men even unlearned and illiterate the gift of Tongues, the greatest almost of all Miracles, (He it was that) effected the (extraordinary) change at Babel by a Power evidently Divine.

BEFORE him the great Bochart had express'd the same thing (b). *The Confusion of Tongues God alone introduc'd.—— The same Babylon, where other Languages had their Birth, was always fatal to the Hebrew, once in the Confusion of Tongues, and a second*

(b) *Geograph. Sacr. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. Confusionem Linguarum solus invexit Deus. —— Eadem Babylon, ubi cæteræ linguæ natæ sunt, semper Hebraicæ fuit fatalis, semel in confusione linguarum, & rursus cum Judæi ibi captivi patrium sermonem dedidicerunt.*

time when the Jews in their Captivity there, forgot the Language of their own Country.

Gerard Vossius likewise. (i) We learn from the Divine Moses, that upon the division of the World, which was made in the Days of Heber, after the Confusion of Languages, the East fell to the Portion of Shem's Posterity; &c. He has intimated the same in another part of his Works (k).

Joseph Scaliger indeed has but hinted as much in his 242d Epistle, to Richard Thompson, as also his Father Julius Cæsar Scaliger (l); but however I am very sure you will find it exceeding difficult to prove that either of them ever express'd any doubt concerning the Text in dispute.

To these I have added in the Margin Du-

(i) *Præf. ad Lib. de Vit. Serm.* Ex divino Mose cognoscimus, in divisione mundi, quæ post *confusionem Linguarum* temporibus Heberi facta est, Orientem obvenisse posteris Semi, Meridiem iis, qui à Chamo descendissent; Septentrionem & Occidentem generi Japheti.

(k) *De Grammatica Lib. 1. cap. 9.* scribit (*Simplicius Comment. 46. in Aristotel. 2. de cælo*) Callisthenem Aristotelis rogatu misisse in Græciam observationes Chaldæorum ab annis 1903 ante tempora Alexandri. Id fuerit annis circiter ducentis ante natum Abrahamum, paulo ante *struendam turris Babylonica*. Nempe nihil prohibet, quo minus in terrâ Sennaar literis & Astrologiæ vacarent, priusquam de *turri eâ* cogitaretur, vel locus is *Babelis nomen* accepisset.

(l) *Exercitat. adv. Cardanum p. 259.* Puer ego ab Hebræis accepi tot (*sexaginta sc. & duas*) esse linguarum differentias, in quas vox, unius antea modi, ad *mirificam illam turrim* facta esset *μυρίων ἀνθρώπων*. &c.

ret¹, Daniel Heinfius², Selden³, Huetius⁴,

¹ *Thesfor des Lang.* Cap. 3. Le grande & admirable Prophete Moÿse après avoir décrit en son histoire du *Genese* ch. 10. fort particulièrement les generations des enfans de Noé & la division des Isles, des Nations, par leurs regions un chacun en sa langue, selon leurs enfans & familles entre leurs gens, escrit au ch. 11. ensuivant ce que s'ensuit. Alors toute la terre universelle estoit d'un mesme langage & parole, & advint comme ils se departirent d'Orient qu'ils trouverent une campagne en la terre de Sennaar, & y habiterent, & dirent l'un à l'autre, or çà faisons des briques & les cuisons au feu. Si eurent des briques au lieu de pierres, & de l'argile au lieu de ciment, puis dirent edifions nous une tour, de laquelle le Sommet soit jusques au Ciel, faisons que nous ayons renommée, afin que peradventure ne soyons dispersez sur toute la terre; adonc le Seigneur descendit pour voir la dite tour qu'edifioient les fils des hommes. *And a little lower.* Les Hebreux escrivent que le mot Babel est derivé de la racine בבל Balal qui signifie confondre & brouiller, le quel mot fut donné & imposé a la tour bastie par Nembrod, appelée par les septente deux interpretes Grecs en leur version Grecque *σύνυμι* confusion à cause qu'en icelle le Seigneur Dieu confondit la premiere langue du Monde, ainsi qu'il est confirme en l'Ecriture Sainte *Gen.* 11.

² *Prolegom. ad Aristarchum Sac.* p. 676. Ut *Lingux olim ad discordiam pœnamque calitius inducta*, postea a S Spiritu in usum veritatis ac concordix sanctificatæ sunt, ita post hanc vitam ea commendabitur præ reliquis quæ Creatorem suum optimè laudabit. Quia ibi neque *Babel* erit, propter unanimi- tatem, neque *multis variisque* opus erit *linguis*, quia unus erit populus unusque omnium ac idem Deus.

³ *Prolegom. ad Deos Syr.* Cap. 2. Babyloniorum, Assyrio- rum, & Aramæorum primò Ebræum Sermonem fuisse pa- lam est ex eo, quod ante *Linguarum Divisionem*, eorum re- giones incoherent, qui unius, ut *Scriptura ait*, labii erant.

⁴ *Demonst. Evangel. Propos.* 6. Cap. 13. Probabilior hæc est sententia, & Doctorum Hominum ac sanctorum etiam Patrum aliquot consensu receptissima, linguam Hebraicam mundo ipsi cœvam esse, & Adami, priorumque Patriarcha- rum usu concelebratam, post *Babelicam linguarum divisionem*, in Semi ac deinde Eberi familiâ integram ad Abrahamum usque, & Israeliticam gentem perseverasse.

Vitringa,

Vitringa (q), *Perizonius* (r), *Morin* (s), and *Dr. Wootton* (t), all concurring in the same Sentiments, all Men of Letters and tracers of Languages.

I WILL cite but one Writer more on this point, and that is *Augustin Calmet*, the very Person you refer to in your Margin. I have not indeed seen as yet the particular Piece which you quote of him, but, unless the Learned Benedictine can be guilty of gross inconsistency, I may venture to vouch him in favour of my self, and opposition to you. In his Scripture Dictionary, under the word Babel, he speaks thus. *Babel, ou Babylone. Ce Terme signifie confusion; Et on donna ce*

(q) *Observat. Sac. Lib. 1. & passim.*

(r) *Origin. Babylon. Cap. 8.* Moſes — hæc *Historia Sacra* lacinia non tam id egit, ut exponeret Babelis Originem, quam ut traderet Rationem & Causam, per quam Noachidæ, quum fuissent antea ut necessum erat conjuncti *Lingua*, habitatione, & unius Populi Formâ, separati ab se invicem & dispersi in diversa terrarum abierint, atque ita evaserint dein etiam *Lingua* & Societatis jure discreti. — Verum hæc ipsa lacinia, quæ cæteroquæ sic satis liquida videtur, absque unâ & alterâ foret difficultate, de quibus ex professo agemus, variis tamen interpretationibus, in contraria sæpe discedentibus, & complures rei gesta circumstantias quas *Scriptura* & ignorat, nec desiderat sed respuit, commiscentibus, non parum insuper obscuratur. Vid. et. Cap. 9. & 13.

(s) *Exercitat. de Ling. Cap. 8.* Receptam ab antiquis & recentioribus auctoribus de *Linguarum multiplicatione in Campis Babylonicis* amplectimur, atque existimamus ex propriis sacri Codicis verbis evidentè fluere, *Labium sive sermonem unum* & eadem verba adhuc obtinuisse in toto terrarum Orbe, cum turris Babylonicæ insanum opus aggressi sunt Homines, ut patet Genes. 11. 1.

(t) Discourse concerning the Confusion of Languages.

nom à la ville & à la province de Babylone; par ce qu'à la construction de la tour de Babel, Dieu confondit la langue des hommes qui travailloient à cet edifice; en sorte qu'ils ne pouvoient plus s'entendre. On débite diverses conjectures sur la maniere dont s'est fait la confusion des langages à Babel, qui ne sont point de nôtre sujet. — L'Ecriture dit simplement que les Hommes étant partis de l'Orient, & étant venus dans la terre de Sennaar, se dirent les uns aux autres: Faisons nous une ville & une tour, dont le sommet s'élève jusqu'au ciel, & rendons nôtre nom célèbre, avant que nous soyons dispersés dans toute la terre. Or le Seigneur voyant qu'ils avoient commencé cet ouvrage, & qu'ils étoient résolus de ne le pas quitter, qu'ils ne l'eussent achevé: descendit & confondit leur langage; en sorte qu'ils furent contraints de se disperser par toute la terre, & d'abandonner leur Entreprise. And under the word *Langue*. Les profanes, qui n'ont pas en connoissance des Livres saints, ni de l'Histoire de la Creation du Monde, se sont imaginez que les hommes ayant été produit au hasard en differens endroits du Monde, & étant sortis de la terre, de même que les autres animaux, étoient d'abord sans langage & sans connoissances; que premièrement la nécessité & ensuite l'utilité leur firent inventer certains sons & certains termes, pour l'expliquer & pour se faire entendre les uns aux autres; que de

de là se formèrent les Langues, qui sont si différentes entre elles, parce qu'elles ont été inventées séparément, & sans que ceux qui en sont les premiers auteurs, ayent eu aucune liaison, ni aucun commerce les uns avec les autres. Mais la connoissance que nous avons de l'origine de l'homme, ne nous permet pas de douter que Dieu que créa Adam parfait, ne lui ait donné un langage, pour exprimer ses pensées & ses sentimens. — Ses enfans & ses successeurs parlèrent apparemment le même langage jusqu'au deluge, & depuis le déluge, jusqu'à la confusion arrivée à Babel.

WHAT think you now of your *Men of Letters and tracers of Languages*? Do they all seem to refer the variety of them wholly to *Reason and Nature*, to the rise and fall of *States and Empires*, change of *Modes and Customs*, without any sort of *Divine Interposition*? Do they sneer the *Scripture History of Babel*, and the simplicity and ignorance of those who believe it? Or can you produce in defense of your self any abler *Criticks*, of superior *Genius*, *Abilities*, *Industry*, and *Application*? I am very well assur'd, you neither will nor can.

WELL! but, say you, is it not certain, that *Men of Learning* have in fact demonstrated the *Causes*, and deduc'd the *History* of most particular languages from their source and Origin not only of those which now obtain,

B

but

but of such also, as the' once flourishing, are now no longer in common use and practice, as the Greek, Latin, Italian, French &c.

HAVE not many both of the *Antients* and *Moderns* endeavour'd to prove, that the Hebrew was the first and common language of all till in process of time, thro' the influence of the Causes above hinted at, all other Languages sprang out of it, as naturally, as many Shoots from the same Root, many Branches from the same Stock?

VERY little truth in all this; and supposing the whole to be true, no impeachment as yet against *Moses*, no incredibility in the Babel-Confusion.

BUT, have Men of Letters in tracing the Origin and Antiquity of the several Languages thought it necessary to run back to Babel? No truly in those Languages whose Origin they have really traced to any purpose. If they had they must have forfeited all their title to *Critique*, and deserv'd the ridicule and censure of all Mankind. This may seem to you perhaps nothing less than Mystery and Paradox. But I'll give you a clear and distinct explication of it in the following Pages, and shew you what a wretched mass of Error, and Confusion lies in the Queries abovesaid,

You ask, whether Men of Learning have not deduc'd to a Demonstration most of the particular

particular Languages both *dead* and *living* from their *Source* and *Origin*; This is all Perplexity, Ambiguity, and Artifice. I answer, Many of the Living they have, but most of the Dead they have not, and *few* ever pretended to it, and none have perform'd it to any tolerable Degree of Success and Satisfaction. And I farther assure you, that whatever Discoveries they have made in Language, the *Mosaick* History will not, cannot suffer any real Prejudice from them. To come to Particulars.

You instance first in the *Greek*, as a Language *trac'd* by *Men* of Learning to its *Source* and *Origin*. Pray, what kind of *Source* and *Origin* do you mean? Its Origin as to *Characters*, or as to *Substance* and *Idiom*? As to the latter, that (being a different Thing from a *Word* or *Phrase*, of which more hereafter) was never so much as attempted or thought of, as far as I ever heard by Men of Learning; and the first (if that be your Meaning) is no Manner of Help to your Side of the Question. This requires some Enlargement and Illustration.

SUPPOSE it therefore at present, to be shewn by great Numbers of Authors (u) Ancient

(u) Herodotus Lib. 5. Timon. ap. Var. Critias ap. Athen. Lib. 1. Plin. Lib. 7. Cap. 57. Justin. Mart. in Paran. Tacit. Annal. 11. Clem. Alexand. Stromat. Lib. 1. Irenæus adv. Hæres. Lib. 1. Cap. 12. §. 4. Euseb. Præp. Evang. Lib. 10. Cap. 5. Marius Victorinus Grammat. Lib. 1.

ent and (m) Modern, that *Cadmus* introduced Letters first into *Greece* from *Phœnicia*, in Number sixteen, and in the old *Hebrew* or *Phœnician* Character, about the Time that *Othniel* (x) was Judge among the *Jews*, many Years before the *Trojan War*. I allow that four were afterwards added to the first sixteen by *Palamedes*, and four more to those many Ages later by the Poet *Simonides*. But what then? Will you say upon the Strength of this Discovery that the *Greek Language* has been traced up to its Origin, not distinguishing between *Letters* and *Language*? Did ever any Man of Learning suppose that the *Nature*, *Idiom*, and *Form* of the *Greek Tongue* took its Rise and Date from the *Greek Letters*? Childish! if this be your Notion. For what do you imagine might be the *Language* in *Greece* before *Cadmus* introduced his *Phœnician Letters*, during the Space of several hundred Years, from *Javan* the Son of *Japhet*, (from whom the *Iawves* (y) or *Iowns* certainly

(x) Scaliger in Euseb. Digress. Ionic. Lit. p. 102. & Epist. 242. ad Richard. Tomplonum. Epist. 362 ad Stephanum Ubertum. Vossius de Grammat. Lib. 1. Cap. 10. Grot. in Not. ad Lib. 1. Ver. Christ. Rel. §. 15. Ezechiel. Spanhem. Præstant & U. Numism. Antiq. Lib. 2. Cap. 2. Montfaucon Palæograph. Græc. Lib. 2. Cap. 1. Bochart. de Colon. Phœnic. Lib. 1. Cap. 20. Walton Prolegom. 2. §. 6, 9. Steph. Morinus de Linguis Part 2. Cap. 4. Edm. Chishul. ad Inscript. Sigeam.

(y) Vossius ibid.

(z) Eusebius in Chron. Græc. p. 12. *Ιωνες* ἱεὶς *Ἑλλήνες* αἱ *ἰαυες*. Joseph. Antiq. Lib. 1. Cap. 6. *Ἀπὸ Ἰαυαυς Ἰαυία* αἱ *παῖδες Ἑλλήνες*. Hieron. Tradit. Hebraica in Gen. *Javan*. *Iones*, qui & *Græci*, unde mare *Ionium*. Grot. Annot. ad Lib. 1. Ver. Rel. Christ. Bochart. Geogr. Sac. Lib. 3. Cap. 3.

certainly took their Name and Origin) to *Othoniel* Judge among the *Jews*? Undoubtedly Greek, the same in General and Substance with that which was spoke and wrote after *Cadmus's* Letters. Unless you will reply that Language depends upon Letters, and where there are no Letters, there the Human Species must be mute, or at least without any articulate Sounds and Discourse. I'll clear this matter up by an eminent Instance. We learn from *Socrates* (x), *Vossius* (a), *Morin* (b) and others (c), that the *Gothick* Nation, or at least the greatest part of it were without any Letters, till the Year of Christ 370, and then were first taught them by *Ulphilas* or *Gulphilas* a Christian Bishop. Now would any one venture to assert, that because we have trac'd the Origin of the *Gothick* Letters, we have therefore found the Origin of the *Gothick* Language? Certainly not. And hence it is, that learned Men, tho' they have fix'd the Origin of the *Gothick* Letters, are yet so little agreed and satisfied concerning the Origin and Nature of the Language. *Quant à leur langue, il ne s'en trouve point de marques, dont on peust seurement parler.* Duret. p. 863 (d). You may now by this

(x) Lib. 4. Cap. 27. (a) *Vossius* de Grammat. Lib. 1. Cap. 9. (b) *Stephanus Morin.* de Linguis. Part. 2. Cap. 2.

(c) *Versus Vet ap, Pet Crinitum.* Mabillon. de Re Diplom. Lib. 1. Cap. 11. Sect. 3.

(d) Vid. et. *Joseph. Scaliger.* de Linguis Europæ. Gesner. *Mithridat.* p. 47. & *Waser.* in Not. p. 109.

16 R E M A R K S.

time easily perceive how little Truth, Sence, and Significancy there is in your *Histories, Sources, and Origins* of the *several Languages*, especially at present with regard to the *Greek*. The least acquaintance with Critique and Philology will shew you your error, and the same learned Men whom you usher in with so much Pomp, Triumph, and Solemnity, will upon a diligent and prudent examination immediately correct your misapprehension, and readily disown the mighty Discoveries you compliment them with. But I have still something farther to observe upon the Greek Language.

You tell me, that all Languages whatever, as many *Antients and Moderns* have endeavour'd to prove, did originally spring out of the *Hebrew*, as naturally as many Shoots from the same Root. Here again, you take shelter in fallacy, and wrap yourself up in ambiguity. For pray, what sort of Idea would you please to annex to the word *spring*. It is capable of no less than three widely different meanings. 1st. It may signify only, that the Hebrew was the first Language that ever appear'd in the World after the Creation. If this is all that you mean, it is a very weak and inconclusive Argument against the *Story of Babel*, because the same Learned Men who attribute that Honour and Prerogative to the Hebrew Language, have nevertheless receiv'd with

with all submission and reverence the Scripture History of the Confusion, as you will find in *Buxtorf*, *Bochart*, *Walton*, and *Morin* in the places abovesited. A second meaning of the word *spring* may be, that from the Hebrew, *Letters* were first deriv'd into other Languages, and thus may be stil'd, with a little impropriety the *Mother* of other Languages. In this sence indeed I may allow that the Greek *sprang* from the Hebrew, but without the least disadvantage to my self or gain to you. The 3^d and last meaning of the word may be, that all other Languages *Spring* from the *Hebrew*, as so many Dialects of it, varying and diversified according to Time and other Accidents, but continuing in General and Substance the same with the Mother Tongue. This perhaps may be your real Sense, as carrying seemingly the most Authority against the *Story of Babel*. Now as in the other two meanings, I have before shewn your *Consequence* to be false and illogical, so here in this last, I will prove *your* Premises and Matter of Fact to be nothing better than Air and Fiction, I am only concern'd at present for the Greek Language; the others I shall venture to touch upon afterwards. You tell me, the *Greek* is originally only a Dialect of the *Hebrew*. I would desire to know, upon what Authority? Experimental Knowledge and attentive Comparison

C

of

of them both? Impossible! I should think there is no Similitude in the two Languages, that can give any ground or countenance to such a notion. Every part of Speech throughout the Grammars, from *Noun* to the minutest *Particle*, is a clear and irrefragable Argument against it. Have the *Greeks* any *affixes* or *præfixes*, *præformantes* or *efformantes*, Letters *Radical* and *Servile*, words *Heemantick*, *castrations* of *Vowels* &c. Has the *Hebrew* on the other side any *Cases* and *declensions* in *Nouns*; any *Aorists*, *Futures* 1 and 2, *paulo post Futurums*, such a Variety of *Moods* as the *Greek*? Add to this, that the whole Turn, Idiom, and Phraseology of the *Greek* is totally different from that of the *Hebrew*. The only Resemblance that I can perceive between them, is in the Alphabet; but as the Cause of it is known to every Scholar, the Question will not in the least be affected by it. But in Languages that are really and truly nothing but Dialects of the *Hebrew*, the Case is quite otherwise. *Syriack* and *Chaldee* bear a Similitude to the *Hebrew*, in almost every particular of Grammar and Phraseology (a); and from hence it was that *Lucas Burgensis* pronounc'd them so easy to be learnt (b) after the *Hebrew*. You will answer perhaps, that many *Hebrew* words ap-

(a) Vid. *Buxtorf*. Grammat. Chald. & Syriac. *Ludovicus de Dieu* Grammat. Ling. Oriental.

(b) Ap. *Walton*. Proleg. 12. Sect. 2.

pear in the *Greek* Language with a small variation. I grant it, and could shew it in a great number of Instances. But you cannot conclude with any justness from thence, that *Greek* is only a *Dialect* of *Hebrew*. The *Teutonic* has deriv'd abundance of Words from the *Persian* Tongue, and the *Spanish* from the *Arabick*(c), will you therefore call the *Teutonic* a *Dialect* of the *Persian*, or the *Spanish* of *Arabick*? The *English* Tongue has borrow'd multitudes of Expressions from the *French*, must the *English* Tongue therefore be stil'd a *Dialect* only of the *French*? Thus far I have trac'd and disprov'd your Assertion of the *Greek* Language, from the Reason and Nature of Things. I will now produce the current Opinions of Learned Men against you. *Joseph Scaliger* (d) says, that the *Greek*, *Latin*, *Teutonic*, and *Sclavonic* are to be look'd upon as four *Matrices*, or Mother Languages, out of which, as from one common Parent, many *Dialects* or *Branches* have deriv'd and spread themselves. And he farther defines those to be properly *Matrices*, that have no Relation or Affinity between them. Here you see the great *Phœnix*

(c) *Joseph. Scal. Epist. 228. ad Isaac. Pontanum.*

(d) De Linguis Europæ. Sunt — quatuor hæc Verba Deus, Θεός, Godt, Boge, notæ quatuor — Matricum, Latinæ, Græcæ, Teutonicæ, Sclavonicæ. — Linguas Matricēs vocare possumus, ex quibus multa Dialecti, tanquam propagines deductæ sunt. Propagines quidem unius matricis lingua commercio inter se aliquo conjunctæ sunt: Matricum vero inter se nulla cognatio est.

of his Age, who had trac'd the Languages with as much Learning, Skill, and Judgment as any Man, gives the Title of *Matrix* to no less than three Languages besides the *Greek*, whereas you would persuade us that the *Hebrew* alone has any claim or pretension to it. Bp. *Walton* (e) tells us, that among the several Languages known to us, some are called by the Learned *Cardinal* ones, from which many others have sprung, and multiplied, as 1st *The Hebrew*, 2^d *The Greek*, &c. I could add a third excellent Critick (f), but these two Persons, I believe, may satisfy you and every Reader with respect to the generality of the *Men of Letters*, that it was never their Opinion, that the *Greek Language*

(e) *Prolegom.* 1. *Sect.* 14. Quædam inter linguas nobis cognitæ quasi *Cardinales*, e quibus multæ aliæ pullulârunt, à *Doctis* recensentur. 1. *Hebræa* unde *Chaldaica*, five *Syriaca*, *Chanaanitica*, *Punica*, *Arabica*, — *Armena*, *Æthiopica*, & ex parte *Persica*. 2. *Græca*, cum variis ejus *Dialectis*, tam quinque vulgò notis, quam aliis plurimis; quæ per diversas *Urbes* gentesque *Græciæ* finitimas & per *Varias*, ubi *Græcorum Imperium* vigeat, nationes extensa, cum aliis mixta novas linguas produxit.

(f) *Daniel Heinsius Prolegom. ad Exercit. sac. p. 30.* Adde quod nec *Idioma Orientis*, ad verbum cum exprimitur, satis ipsi vel utique affectu sint, vel utique, ut oportet, expresserint *Græci*. Cum vix dici possit, quam hæc, five *Dialectus* five *Lingua*, a *Græcismo* longè abeat nonnunquam: quamquam casu seu κατὰ συνήθειαν, ut alibi docuimus, cum *Hebraismo* ut & *Syriasmo* *Græca* quoque *Phrasis* convenire possit: quod in omnibus fit *Linguis*. Ut omnino nihil dicant, qui malignè potius quam verè hæc de re pronunciarunt. Cum & de *Græcismo* omnibusque autoribus antiquis *Græcis*, tum & istis qui ab illis quàm longissimè recedunt, rectum requiratur hîc judicium.

Sprang

sprang from the *Hebrew* as a *branch* from a *Root*; Some, I know there have been, who have freely indulg'd themselves in that way of thinking (g), but with too precipitate a fondness for a singular Notion, having no other argument, proof, or Discovery for it but this, that the *Greek* Tongue in a long course of Ages, had adopted many words and expressions from the *Hebrew*. But this is Evidence far from being clear, cogent, and convincing; and after what has been said, I shall venture to declare, that for ought any thing You or I or the *Men of Letters* know to the Contrary, the *Greek* Language may be one of those many that arose from the *Babel-Confusion*.

I NOW pass on to consider the *Latin* and other Languages.

THE *Latin* Tongue you give as a second instance of *Languages trac'd* to their *Source* and *Origin* by *Men of Learning*. Still in the dark, confus'd, and unintelligible! *Latin* as it stands in your Letter, without any Definition or Explication, is a word wholly æquivocal and illusive. One would think by your way of Expression, that there could only be one Sense affix'd to it, whereas it is really and certainly capable of four, and upon the clear Distinction of the several Senses,

(g) Ap. *Walton*. Prolegom. 1. Sect. 10. *Vitringam*. Observat. sac. cap. 6.

depends the Truth of your Assertion, and the Justness of the Argument. You must know, the *Latin* Language is nicely distinguish'd by Criticks into four Sorts, the *Prisca*, the *Latina*, *Romana*, and *Mixta* (b). The

(b) *Gesner. in Mithridat. p. 65. Ed. 2da. ex Pet. Crinit.* Relatum est quatuor fuisse apud nostros (i. e. Romanos) linguarum proprietates, hoc est, *Priscam, Latinam, Romanam, Mixtam*, quod ex *Varronis* Authoritate Grammatici Veteres tradunt. *Prisca* est, quâ vetustissimi Italiæ populi sub Jano videlicet & Saturno regibus usi sunt: cujusmodi carmina quædam incondita, parumque nostris intellecta adhuc supersunt: ut *Saliorum & Argeorum sacra*, de quibus Varro etiam Terentius meminit. *Latina* verò, quam sub Latino & Regibus Tusciæ cæteri quidem Populi in ipso Latio loquebantur: quâ tabulæ Decemvires scriptæ sunt, ac sacræ Leges, & publica quædam edicta. *Romana*, quæ post exactos Reges Romanos populi Gesta complexa est. Nam & hanc ipsam inter Poetas M. Plautus, Nævius, Accius, Pacuvius, Ennius & P. Virgilius maximè coluerunt. Ex oratoribus autem & Historicis M. Cato, Sisenæ, Quadrigarius, Val. Antias, Cæsar, & M. Cicero. *Mixta* vero, quæ aucto Imperio & Libertate amissâ, varios populos ac Nationes in jura Civitatis admisit, quo factum est, ut Romana virtus ac loquendi juxta integritas passim cum moribus degeneraret. *Gerard Vossius Præf. ad Lib. de Vitiis Sermon.* Habuit Sermo *Latinus* ætatem crescentem, habuit decrecentem, habuit inter utramque vigorem suum. Crescentem divido in Pueritiam, & adolescentiam. Ad priorem refero *Salii* Numæ Pompilii, ac similes hymnos, quos ævo optimo vix Sacerdotes sui intelligebant; item *leges Regias ac Decemvires*; necnon Pontificum *Leges & Annales*; ad hæc columnam *Rostratam Duillii*, aliaque his similia. Adolescentiam auspicamur à *Livio Andronico*; quem secuti inter alios Nævius, Ennius, Pacuvius, Attius: meliorque his *Portius Cato*, cujus Libri de R. Rusticâ perdurârunt: cæterorum fragmenta solum habemus. Optimi verò in Adolescentia hæc Plautus, Terentiusque, Vigorem verò ac maturitatem in prosâ habent Cicero, Cæsar, &c. in Carmine Lucretius, Catullus, Maro &c. — Posteaquam verò Roma priùs sub Odoacro, mox sub Gothis fuit: ac à variis Gentibus, quas Romani barbaras vocârunt, miserè discerptum est Imperium; Sermonem Romanum, non jam quasi decrepitum,

Prisca is that sort of *Latin* which was antiently in Use among the first Inhabitants of *Italy* in the Days of *Janus* and *Saturn*, before any Colonies from *Greece* had settlement there, and is call'd by *Gerard Vossius*, *Primo-genia*, or the *Primitive* Language of *Latium*. The *Latina*, was a *Latin* of something later Date, the Language of King *Latinus*, and the People of his Time, in which were compos'd perhaps the famous 12 Tables, the Laws and Annals of the High Priests, and some Publick Edicts, corrupted a little from the Primitive, by Greek intermixtures and adulterations. The *Romana* was that which was introduc'd first in the Writings of *Nævius*, *Ennius*, *Pacuvius*, *Attius*, and *Cato*, cultivated afterwards with great Improvements by *Plautus*, *Terence*, &c. and brought at last to the highest Perfection of Purity and Elegance, by *Lucretius*, *Catullus*, *Virgil*, *Cicero*, *Cæsar*, *Sallust*, *Livy*, &c. The *Mixta*, the 4th sort of *Latin*, was that which arose after the great

crepitum, sed dixero moribundum vel potius emortuum, magisque cadaveri quam vivo similem corpori. *Cangius Illustriss.* in *Præf. ad Glossar. Lat.* Sect. 2. *Latinas* Linguas quatuor quidam esse dixerunt, *Priscam*, *Latinam*, *Romanam*, *Mixtam*. *Priscam*, quâ vetustissimi *Italiæ* Populi sub *Jano* & *Saturno* sunt usi, incondita ut se habent carmina *Saliorum*. *Latinam* deinde, quam sub *Latino* & *Regibus Tusciæ* cæteri in *Latio* sunt locuti. *Romanam*, quæ post exactos *Reges* in *Populo Romano* viguit. — *Mixtam* denique, quæ post *Imperium* latius promotum simul cum moribus & hominibus in *Romanam* *Civitatem* irrepsit, integritatemque verbi per *Solæcismos* & *Barbarismos* corruptit. *Vid. et. Duret. 770, & seqq.*

decline

decline and decay both of the *Roman* Empire and Language, made up of numberless Barbarisms and Solecisms from many Nations and Languages, and preserving but little Remains of that which is stil'd *Classick Latin*. Now take the Latin Language in either of the last three Senses, I will readily allow that it has been trac'd to its Origin. But what does it prove? Just nothing at all against the *Story of Babel*. Because tho' *Latin* according to the three last Denominations and Kinds, may admit of a certain Date, and Historical *Deduction* from *Men of Letters*, yet the first fort, the Antient and Primitive Language of *Italy* and the Parts adjacent, stands still unoriginated without any particular *Æra*, *Cause*, and Account fix'd to it. This is imported in the very name of it *Prisca*, signifying only in general its superior Antiquity to the others, without any particular Mark, Description and Character of it; and therefore notwithstanding what some have objected (i) concerning the *Latin* i. e. the *Romana*, or *Latina* being only a derivative and dialect of the *Greek*, the *Prisca* may ultimately be referr'd to the *Babel-Confusion*, without any Impossibility, Anacronism or Charge of ἀντοκεισία.

HAVING hitherto shewn how exceeding raw and unexperienc'd you are in the affair of Languages, and how little qualify'd to ar-

(i) *Vitring. Observat. sac. Lib. I. Cap. 7. Sect. 23.*

gue and determine upon them, I shall now endeavour to give you some farther Knowledge and Insight into those Matters, by setting the Discoveries of Learned Linguists, in their true and proper Light from short Extracts out of their own Writings.

I WILL therefore in the Sequel consider what Languages *have* been *trac'd* to their *Origin*, what have not, and how far the *Mosaick* History is affected by such Deductions.

IT is then very carefully to be observ'd, that whatever Languages, (except the *Hebrew*) have been really trac'd to any natural *Source* and *Origin* by Men of Learning, are such as are properly Modern, and grown into Use in the latter Ages only of the World, and substituted in the Room of others more Antient and pure. To begin with the Language of our own Country *England*. We learn from many Writers (*k*), that the *English* Language was first introduc'd by the *Saxons* being one Dialect of the *Teutonick* (*l*), and afterwards adulterated by another Dialect of it, the *Danish* and *Norman*. Be it therefore allow'd that the *English* Language is *trac'd* to its *Origin*, and easily accounted for from *Reason*, *Mutability* of *Human Things*, *Rise* and *Fall* of *States* and *Kingdoms*. But what will you

(*k*) *Gesner. Mithrid.* p. 9. & 13. *Scaliger. de Ling. Europ.* *Duret.* p. 873.

(*l*) *Matricis Godt (Teutonice)* propagines five idiomata præcipua sunt tria, *Teutonismus*, *Saxonismus* & *Danismus*. *Scal. ib.*

do with the Original and Primitive Language of *Britain*? Where will you fix its Birth and Source from the time the Isle was Inhabited, to the *Saxon* Conquest. Here the Criticks and the *Men of Learning* are wholly at a stand. They tell us indeed, that the *British* Language was the same with the *Tartaric* (m), but the *Tartaric* it self they do not trace to its Fountain: And *Gerard Vossius* seems to think that the *British* as well as the old *Gallic*, *Spanish*, and *German* Tongues sprang originally from *Japhet's* eldest Son *Gomer* and his Posterity (n). The same thing may be seen and exemplifi'd in other Languages. The *French*, *Italian*, and *Spanish* Tongues, are very well known to be nothing more than Corruptions and Mixtures of *Latin*, *Francic*, and *Celtic* (o). And these it is true are easily trac'd up to their *Source* and *Origin*. But as they were very late in Existence, and did but succeed to Languages of higher Antiquity, those that preceded, lie still out of Reach and Knowledge, and can-

(m) Walton *Prolegom.* 1. §. 14.

(n) Europææ autem Scythiæ terras, Tanai trajecto, occupant Cimmerii; — A Gomero illos filiorum (Japheti) natu maximo, ab illis verò Cimbros genus ducere, vulgatio opinio est. Ex hisce locis quæ diximus paulatim sunt profecti in terras alias atque alias Communis verò lingua fuit Scythis & Celtis; hoc est, Germanis, & veteribus Gallis, Hispanis, Britannis. Sed hi postea multum à primogeniâ recesserunt. *Pref. ad Lib. de Vit. Serm.*

(o) Matrix Deus (Latina) peperit Italicam. Gallicam & Hispanicam. Scalig. *Ling. Europ. Gesner. Mithrid.* p. 25, 49, 57.

not be trac'd to their Fountain any more than the Head of *Nile*. Thus it is also in the several Branches and Derivatives of other Primary and Antient Languages. Whatever out of these have been with any clearness and certainty trac'd up to their Origin (the Number of which comparatively is exceeding small) may justly be esteem'd as of Yesterday, owing their Rise to a Series of Ages, and Varieties of Accidents; whereas the Original and Primitive Tongues, have buried their Nativity in a numerous Train of After-Generations, and are prior perhaps not only to History, but Letters themselves. It would be tedious and endless to transcribe in this place from *Gesner*, *Scaliger*, *Bochart*, *Walton*, and others, a particular and accurate account of every single Language. I shall think it sufficient to touch at present upon Generals only, and give you in a few Hints subject for any nicer Examination. Let us therefore suppose it to be shewn at large, by Men of Learning, that the several Languages of *Dalmatia*, *Muscovy*, the *Vandali*, *Croati*, of *Bobemia*, *Polonia*, *Lithuania* and fifty others reckon'd up by *Gesner*, are all Species with some Corruption of the *Sclavonic* (p).

(p) *Sclavonica* sive *Illyrica*, longè per *Europam* & *Asiam* se extendens, sub quâ *Dalmatica*, *Muscovitica*, *Vandalica*, *Croatia*, *Bohemica*, *Polonica*, *Lithuanica*, aliæque ejus quasi Dialecti. *Walton*. *Proleg.* 1. §. 14. Hæc Matrix sive Lingua Boge (i. e. *Sclavonica*) in multas propagines diffusa est, *Rutenicam*, *Polonicam*, *Boëmicam*, *Illyricam*, *Dalmaticam*, *Windicam* &

Let us again suppose that the present Languages of *Germany, Helvetia, Suevia, Westphalia, Austria, Belgia, Wales, Denmark, Sueden, Norway*, and others have been all shewn to be several species of *Teutonick* (q). Let us farther suppose the Languages of the most Northern Nations to be several adulterated branches of the *Tartaric* or *Scythian* (r). To pass from *Europe* into *Asia* and *Africa*. Let us take it for granted, that the modern *Ægyptian* is prov'd to be a Dialect made up of *Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Arabick* and *Æthiopick* (s); that the vulgar *Æthiopic* was first

alias quas unusquisque potest adjicere. *Joseph. Scal. Ling. Europ.* Enumeratio alphabetica populorum qui *Illyricâ* (i. e. *Sclavonicâ*) linguâ utuntur. *Abgazari* vel *Abgazelli* qui & *Gazari* circa mare *Caspium*, *Æstui*, *Arbenses*, *Bessi*, hodiè *Bosnenses* vel *Bosnajienses*, *Bohemi*, *Borussii*, *Bulgari*, *Carni*, *Carniolani*, &c. *Gesner in Mithrid.* p. 60. Quis nescit natam esse ex *Sclavonicâ*, *Polonicam*, *Hungaricam*, *Bohemicam*, *Dalmaticam*, *Croaticam* &c. *Bochar. Geogr. Sacr. Lib. 1. Cap. 15.*

(q) *Teutonica* sive *Germanica*, unde *Germanica* communis, *Helvetica Teutonica* priscae proxima, *Suevica*, *Westphalica*, *Austriaca*, *Belgica* per *Flandriam*, *Brabantiam*, *Bataviam*, aliasque regiones disseminata, & *Cambrica*, sub quâ *Danicam*, *Suedicam*, *Norwegicam*, *Anglicam*, *Gothicam* numerant. *Walton. Ibid.* Ex *Germanica* (i. e. *Teutonica*) quis nescit natam esse *Belgicam*, *Anglicam*, *Danicam*, *Norwegicam*, &c. *Bochart* *ibid.* *Scalig. ibid.*

(r) *Tartarica*, quæ longè per septentrionem vagatur, ad quam multæ *Europaorum* & *Asiaticorum* linguæ antiquæ referendæ, si *Boxhornio* credendum, ut antiqua *Gallica* & *Britannica*, cujus reliquæ adhuc in *Walliâ* manent, *Hispanica* antiqua, *Turcica* &c. *Walton. Ibid.*

(s) Quæ lingua (sc. *Ægyptia*) cum sit penitus deleta in *Ægypto* primum per *Græcos*, deinde per *Romanos*, postea per *Saracenos* & *Arabes*, & pauca supersint vocabula in monumentis literarum, non potest facile judicari aut aliquid pro comperto pro-

introduc'd into common use, when the seat of the Kingdom was remov'd from *Axuma*(t); That the Modern *Persic* is little else than a jarring conflux of *Greek, Latin, Arabick, Tartaric* (u) &c. What is the natural and

pronunciari de Linguâ (sc. antiquâ) Ægyptiorum. *Bibliand.* ap. *Duret.* p. 380. *Bochart.* ubi suprâ.

(t) Relicta Axumâ translatoque in mediterraneum Regni imperio, lingua hæc nostra (*Æthiopica antiqua*) in usu vulgari esse desit. Etenim familiâ *Zagaa* deficiente, cum alius Rex ex *Se-wâ*, ubi ferè *Amharicè* loquuntur, peteretur; nonnulli etiam ex *Rupe Ambara* ab exilio in Regnum adsciscerentur, *Ambarica* dialectus in usum venit. Nam novus Rex, linguæ *Tigrænsis* (*Gbeez dicta*) rudis, assumptis familiaribus, qui eodem secum sermone utebantur, vernaculam suam in aulam & castra innoxit; quæ diu ibi & in vicinis oris locata, rarò in *Tigram* movebantur. Eum secuti sunt cæteri Proceres atque magnates; ut mos est Aulicis, Regis mores imitari ejusque dialecto uti. Sic *Ambarica* lingua — cum aulâ & castris per universum Regnum seu Regia circumlata, brevi omnibus aliis dialectis, ipsique antiqua & nobili nostra in communi loquendi Usu prevaluit. *Job. Ludolphus Hist. Æthiop. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. Walton. Proleg. 15. §. 6. & seq.*

(u) Sciendum est in *Persicâ* hodiernâ magnam esse mixturam vocabulorum, ex Gentium varietate, quæ in *Persiam* variis temporibus irruerunt, *Græcorum*, sc. *Romanorum, Arabum, Turcarum, Tartarorum* sub *Tamerlane* &c. *Walton. Proleg. 16. §. 2.* Les Perses qui sont pour le jourd'huy en Perse, sont descendus des Parthes, provenus & procedez de la Scythie, ainsi q'assurent les historiens modernes, la langue Persane du jourd'huy a grand cours & vogue par la plus grand partie de l'Asie, & a autant de Credit & Reputation que la langue Latine en a par tout l'Occident, estant icelle langue procedée du mellange & commixtion des langues *Hebraïque, Chaldaïque, Syriacque, Sarrafinesque, Arabesque, Turquesque, Moresque, Tartaresque*, & autres usitées par toute l'Asie. *Duret. de Ling. Cap. 48. p. 497.* *Zerdusht* seu *Zeratusht* scripsit aliquammultos Libros de variis subjectis, omnes *Linguâ antiquâ in plerisque locis jam obsoletâ.* *Thom. Hyde Pref. ad Religion Vet. Pers.* Præmitto Persas distinguendos esse in Veteres eorumque Sobolem & seros nepotes, — & in moderniores; quæ moderniorum gens ut & eorum *Lingua*, olim ex aliquot aliis confata est, partim

proper Conclusion from all this? That Men of Learning have in fact trac'd to their *Source and Origin* the *several Languages* of the World of *all Times*? That they either have or could possibly account for all the *Varieties* of them from *Reason and Nature, Mutability of Human affairs, rise and fall of States and Empires*? Impossible, by all the Violence and Torture imaginable! For how is the great Hiatus and Intervall fill'd up between the Rise of the Modern and that of Language it self (*w*)? Or how is it reasonable

ex Alienigenis *Saracenis & Tartaris*, præcipuè vero ex aliquibus *Indigenis Parthis & Medis & veteribus Persis* ad *Islemismum* desciscitentibus. *Id. Cap. 1.* Ex voces quæ apud *Herodotum & alios* de linguâ *Persicâ* seu *Parthicâ* esse dicuntur, reverâ sunt ex *Medicâ*, vel saltè maxima earum pars. Illa ipsa lingua *Medica* est quæ hodiè in *Elymaide & Mediâ & Parthiâ & Chorasân* (exceptis quibusdam locis) jam obtinet, & olim cum *Medico* Imperio ibi plantata fuit. Hæcque *Medorum* Lingua *Veterem* Linguam *Persicam reddidit mixtam, & pæne obsoletam effecit.* — Lingua *Medica* ex aliis mixta est, sc. ex *Hebræâ, Græcâ, & Teutonicâ* seu *Gothicâ.* — Et haud mirum est si ex *Parthorum* bello cum *Romanis* aliquæ voces *Latina* etiam in Linguâ *Partbo-Medicâ* reperiantur, cum etiam *Phraates* 4 suos filios *Roma* educandos misit. *Id. Cap. 35.*

(*w*) Enimvero, quæ de Linguarum plurimarum Origine ab *Hebræâ*, vel aliâ huic vicinâ, & successivo apud Populos præcipuos & præcipuè per Europam celebratos ortu — scribuntur, ea magnâ ex parte quidem pro veris aut verisimilibus haberi possunt: sed & multa consistunt in incertissimis conjecturis aut traditionibus, sed nihil admodum faciunt contra primum ortum *Diversitatis Linguarum in Babel* hinc nominatâ quam *Moses* tradidit, & quæ quousque processerit ab initio primo, nostrum non est determinare. Uti sic ex Linguarum *Europæarum* hodiernarum ortu à *Latinâ*, & translatione in varias *Asiæ, Africa, & Americæ* partes jure nemo concluderit, nullam aliam Linguarum varietatem retrò obtinuisse, quam qua sic per sæculorum

to pronounce one Language a *branch* and *root* of another, when there is no Similitude and Analogy discernable between them? The Learned French Nobleman *Mornæus*, and others will teach you the contrary (y).

lorum lapsus introducta fuit occasione diffusæ Romanæ Potentiæ. *Markius Exercitat. Philolog. 1. §. 22.*

(y) Ut ratio ad primum aliquem hominem nos deduxit, ita & ad unam aliquam primam linguam nos eadem deducat oportet &c. Et hanc quidem temporis progressu multipliciter immutatam fuisse suspicari quis posset, *si dialecto tantum differrent. Sed multas linguas esse nemo ignorat, quarum radices omnino diversæ sunt, & quæ nil prorsus commune habent, nisi paucula forte verba, unà cum peregrinis mercibus commæantia* &c. Superest, ut qui colonias in varias Orbis partes duxerunt, illas consulto excogitarent. At quæ vanitas! & quæ ætas in eam rem sufficiat? Et quid inde commodi aut inventores aut comites sperare possint? Imo quis calamitatem & cladem publicam esse non videat? non scientiam, sed ignorantiam, non voluptatem sibi, sed posteris tormentum? Ergo dicat nobis hic Ratio, *quod Scriptura dicit, ab initio unam solummodo linguam fuisse, & ab hominibus non linguas certè divisas multiplicatasve, sed à linguis Homines.* *Mornæus ap. Joan. Marcium Exercit. Philolog. 1. §. 22.*

Unde tot Linguarum Varietas per Orbem Terrarum, si non Divinâ immissione? Præadamita nescio unde derivet sermonum diversitatem. Scio illud, nec unam quidem Linguam produci posse conjunctis Sapientum consiliis, nec unquam factam esse. Possunt sibi fingere voces multas diversas ut ne intelligantur; sed linguam totâ ratione suâque plenitudine aliam nulla hominum sapientia genuerit. Hæc quidem natura linguarum est, ut facile habitum mutant. — *Sed aliud est efflorescere alia vocabula, aliud lingua genium universum intercidere.* Linguam posse interire fatemur, sed millionibus gentium & longo sæculorum lapsu, qui tamen radices relinquit, etsi comam ramosque & Grammaticam mutet, uti factum in Linguâ *Gallicâ, Italicâ, Hispanicâ*, quæ de radice Latinâ, succisâ illâ primâ Romani veterisque Sermonis Arbore, propullulârunt. Linguam igitur deleri, & penitus novam enasci non eveniat annorum millibus, nisi induxeris peregrinitatem ab alio Sermone. Sic autem opprimitur potius, quam ætatis suæ senio & vitio emoritur.

It was obvious enough not only to great, but common Capacities, that if the Antient and Primitive Languages of *Europe*, *Asia* and *Africa* lay still undiscover'd, without any natural *Source* or *Origin* assign'd them by *Men of Letters*, the Scripture-History could not possibly suffer the least Imputation or Prejudice from tracing the modern Derivatives, Dialects, and Branches, the genuine Offspring of length of Time, and the *Mutability of Human affairs*. And that this is really the Case, we have ample assurance from the tacit and express Confession of Linguists and Criticks. Who is there among them of Note and Character that offers and pretends to trace *with Demonstration* (as you term it) the *Teutonick*, *Tartarick*, *Sclavonick*, *Greek*, (which are called *Matrices* or *Mother-Languages* x) to any other Source but that of *Babel*? Who is there, that tells us the Antient and Original Languages of *Ægypt* and *Africa*? Who has ever *deduc'd* the Natural Cause and History of the *Persian* and the *Chinese*? Or what was the Language of *Carthage* before the *Phœnician* was there introduc'd by *Phœnician Colonies*? To say nothing of those mention'd in the *Acts* of the

emoritur. Adèd dixeris illas quæ hodiè extent sermonum diversitates & differentias esse mixturas & farragines illarum Linguarum quas Babylone Deus hominibus immisit. Schotanus ap. eund. ibid. §. 24. Vid. et. Wooton. Confus. Babel.

(x) Walton. Proleg. 1. Joseph. Scalig. Ling. Europ.

Apostles

Apostles Ch. 2. v. 9. & seq. From hence you may see one evident Reason why *Men of Letters in tracing the Origin of Languages, have seldom thought it necessary to run back to Babel.* Because the Language whose Origin has really been *trac'd* by Men of Letters, had no Existence till hundreds not to say thousands of Years after the building that Tower. For what a ridiculous Figure would *Gesner* or *Scaliger* or *Bochart* have made in Chronology, and Critique, if they had refer'd the *French, Italian, English* and many other Tongues to the Babel-Confusion! As on the other side, what arrant Triflers and Children in Reason must they have necessarily appear'd, if because they had found some Languages, taking their Rise from natural Causes 4 or 5 hundred Years ago, they had argu'd against any miraculous Variety of Languages at the Distance of 4 or 5 thousand! I am almost weary of explaining a Thing so Clear and Palpable. I will therefore add but one word or two more on this Head, in Relation to the *Hebrew*. You seem to think that because the *Hebrew* has been prov'd by many Antients and Moderns, to have been the first and common Language of Mankind, it has also been prov'd, that all other Languages are to be look'd upon only as so many *natural* *Dialects* or *Branches* of it. But this is a great Error; (and I have in part confuted it before)

E

For

For your Inference is not supported either by Antients or Moderns. You quote St. *Jerom* in his Comment on *Sophoniah* for your Opinion, but utterly mistake his meaning. He did not intend to insinuate any doubt of the Babel-Confusion (for that would directly contradict what he says on another occasion *z*) but the Sense of the Passage is only, that as the *Hebrew* is Prior to all other Languages, so many *Hebrew* words have pass'd out of that into other Tongues. And thus He explains himself in his Comment on *Isaiab* (*a*). And thus he is understood, and interpreted by *Pererius* and *Bochart* (*b*). As to the Moderns, it cannot indeed be denied, that many of them have endeavour'd to prove that the *Hebrew* was the first and common Language of all. But I will venture to affirm,

(*z*) *Tradit. Hebraica in Genes. 10. Nemrod, Filius Chus arripuit inluetam primus in populo Tyrannidem, regnavitque in Babylone, quæ ab eo quod ibi confusa sunt Lingua Turrim ædificantium Babel appellata est. Babel enim interpretatur confusio. — Heber, à quo Hebræi, vaticinio quodam filio suo Phaleg nomen imposuit, qui interpretatur, Divisio, ab eo quod in diebus ejus Lingua in Babylone divisa sunt.*

(*a*) Omnium pene Linguarum verbisutuntur Hebræi. *Comm. in Isa. Lib. 3. Cap. 7.*

(*b*) *Pererius in Genes. Lib. 16. Hactenus ex Augustino. Cujus Opinonis summa est, Hebraeam Linguam fuisse primam omnium, eaque usum esse omne Genus Hominum ante ædificationem turris Babel. — Eadem est B. Hieronymi sententia, is enim super tertium caput Sophonia, &c. Bochart. Geogr. Sacr. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. Communis illa omnium hominum lingua qualis fuerit, his verbis docet Hierosolymitanus Interpres &c. — Sic Hieronymus in Sophonia Cap. 3. asserit Linguam Hebraicam omnium Linguarum esse Matricem,*

that

that you cannot produce any single Modern of considerable Character and Learning, that ever *endeavour'd to prove*, that in *Process of Time, through the Causes above hinted at*, i. e. purely natural Causes, *all other Languages sprang out of it as naturally as many shoots from the same Root, many branches from the same Stock*. I can easily guess at the Cause of your mistake; You perhaps might have seen some Learned Moderns *deriving* other Languages in some measure from the *Hebrew*; this I know to have been done by several, from *Buxtorf*(c), Bp. *Walton*(d), and others. But they did not derive them from the *Hebrew by natural Causes*, or in *Process of Time*, excluding all Intervention of the Divinity, for they all believ'd and follow'd the Scripture History, as I have shewn you before. These words of yours therefore are added without any ground or Foundation, and speak at random nothing but Fancy and Fiction. And besides this the most judicious Bp. *Walton*, deservedly Censures them for going so far in this sort of *Derivation* as they did. For the whole ground and strength of their Argument, was the Appearance of many *Hebrew* words in other Languages, whereas the same thing happens in almost all sorts of Languages with regard to one another. There

(c) *Buxtorf. Diff.* 2. p. 65.

(d) *Walton. Proleg.* 3. §. 8. *Proleg.* 1. §. 10.

being hardly any one Language known, that does not borrow great numbers of Words from others, as well as from the *Hebrew* (e). While I was writing this, I met with Dr. *Wooton's* Dissertation on this very Subject, I read it over with a great deal of Pleasure and with equal satisfaction, to find so curious a Critick agreeing with me in every Article, where we both had touch'd upon the same point. It may possibly be imagin'd that what he relates of Mr. *Le Clerc*, Mr. *Reland*, and some others, is a strong Confirmation of what you had suggested, that the *story of Babel*, had not made any great Impression on Men of Letters. He tells us indeed (f), that several very good and religious, as well as very Learned and Ingenious Men, had thought that the

(e) Statuendum est non omnes Linguas ex Hebraicâ ortas esse ita ut reliquæ ejus tantum sint Dialecti, prout multi opinantur, qui omnes Linguas ad Hebraicas Origines revocare student. Est quidem *Hebræa* omnium antiquissima; ejusque Reliquiæ quædam in omnibus fere Linguis reperiuntur; quædam etiam Lingua magnam cum Hebræâ affinitatem habent, præsertim quæ *Babyloni* viciniore, ut de *Chaldaicâ*, *Arabicâ*, *Syriacâ*, *Æthiopicâ* & aliis videmus, unde ejus Filia & dialecti improprie dici possunt; proprie tamen & strictè loquendo, linguæ sunt diversæ, quarum qui unam callet, alteram fortè non intelligit. — Multa sanè Verba sunt in diversis Linguis, quæ eundem sonum, imò & significationem habent, non tamen ejusdem sunt Originis, nec Linguarum una ab alterâ derivatur. Similitudo enim hæc Vocum quarundam Casu accidere potest, prout multi sunt vultu similes, non tamen ab iis prægnati quorum vultus referunt; & nulla ferè est Lingua, quæ ex aliis verba quadam non sit mutuata, ex commercio mutuo, coloniis novis, aliisque Causis. Hoc itaque fixum sit, varias & reverà diversas fuisse linguas primævas non Prima Dialectos. Proleg. I. §. 10.

(f) Pag. 6, 7.

only

only Act of God in the Babel-Confusion was *the making the Workmen quarrel; and thereby inducing them to part, and so leave their Work unfinished.* But yet, you see, some Act of God they all appear to have believ'd in that extraordinary Event, agreeably to the sacred Text, and *look'd upon it to be equally the work of God, whether they quarrell'd with one another by his Command, or parted for want of understanding one another's Speech.* They like Men of Judgment and Understanding, knew very well the just and proper Extent of their own Knowledge, and found no manner of Difficulty in reconciling whatever Discoveries they made either probable or certain, with sacred History. So that your fallacious Insinuation, that any *Men of Letters* had rejected the whole *story of Babel* as recorded in *Genesis*, is without the least Countenance from any Quarter. It is saying and inferring more than was ever thought or dreamt of, by the *Tracers of Languages*, they being Men of Religious Principles founded on Reason, Learning, and Truth, that had studied themselves into the justest Abhorrence and Contempt of all Profaneness, Impiety, and *Free-thinking*. The only account that I can possibly give of your gross Misrepresentation of them, is from your not distinguishing between Scripture itself and one certain Interpretation of it. As to Scripture, there is
not

not a single Verse, Word, or Syllable in the 11th Chapter of *Genesis*, relating to the Babel-Confusion, whose divine Authority was ever Disputed by the *Tracers of Languages*. The only thing in Dispute and Controversy among them, was the proper Sense and meaning. שפּה Sapha *Lip* or *Language*, נבלל Nabelá *let us confound*, & בלל balál *confounded*, were ever allow'd to be of sacred Original, however the *Men of Letters* were divided in their different interpretations of those words. And you may with equal propriety of thought and Expression, suggest and pronounce other Passages innumerable in both Old and New Testament, *suspected, uncertain, precarious, and making but little impression on Men of Learning*, because their Obscurity and Ambiguity has so much divided the Men of Learning in their Opinions about them.

THE whole of what has been said, may receive so much Light and Confirmation from the late very Learned and judicious Compilers of Universal History, that I need not scruple inserting the following Passage from them.

The speaking one common language (though it might be of advantage to mankind in other respects) yet being the great obstacle to that division of them into distinct nations which God had for most wise purposes resolved on, he thought fit

fit to break this bond which held them so strictly together, and confound their language, that they should not understand one anothers speech; the natural consequence of which was that they were scattered abroad upon the face of all the earth. This event is mention'd by profane historians, who write that mankind used one and the same language till the overthrow of the tower of Babylon; at which time a multiplicity of tongues was introduced by the gods: whereupon wars ensued, and those whose speech happened to be intelligible to each other, joined company, and seized such countries as they chanced to light upon.

As to the degree of this Babylonish confusion, and the manner wherein it was effected, there is great diversity of sentiments. Several learned Men, prepossessed with an opinion that all the different idioms now in the world did at first arise from one original language, to which they may be reduced, and that the variety which we find among them is no more than must naturally have happened in so long a course of time, supposing a bare separation of the builders of Babel, have been induced to believe that there were no new languages formed at the confusion, but that the most that was done was only to set those builders at variance, by creating a misunderstanding among them. This some think to have been effected without any immediate influence on their language, which
seems

seems contrary to the words and obvious intent of the sacred historian: others have imagined it brought about by a temporary confusion of their speech, or rather of their apprehensions, causing them, while they continued together, though they spake the same language, yet to understand the words differently. A third opinion is, that a variety of inflexions was introduced, and perhaps some new words, which disturbed and perverted the former manner of expression: and this might occasion different dialects, yet could not create new languages. But none of these explications seem fully to answer the apparent design of Moses, which was not only to inform us how mankind were at first dispersed and broken into so many different nations, but to account for the diversity of their languages; a thing very difficult, if not impossible to do, without having recourse to some extraordinary interposition of the divine power. For though time, intercourse with foreign nations, commerce, the invention and improvement of arts and sciences, and the difference of climates cause very considerable alterations in languages, yet the utmost effect we can imagine them to have will not come up to the question. We cannot conceive a language can thereby be so much disfigured, that all the general marks and characteristics should disappear. It is not easy to apprehend how all the words of a language should be intirely chang'd for others; nor is there

there any one instance to be given of any such total change: but it is next to impossible to conceive that so great a diversity as we find in the frame and constitution of languages, wherein the grand and essential differences between them consist, rather in the words which compose them, (as may be observed in the accounts we shall hereafter give of the several languages of which we have any knowledge) could ever have been occasioned by the causes assigned above. The present diversity of tongues in the world is prodigious; and considering the time that has elapsed since the building of Babel, and the alterations made in some known languages in the course of one, two, and three thousand Years, (which alterations we constantly find greater or less in proportion to the intercourse the nation has had with foreigners) and considering that there are many tongues which when compared with others have not the least affinity, so that a man must be the greatest visionary in the world to imagine them the offspring of the same parent, it seems to us that the variety of idioms now spoken can be no way possibly accounted for, without either approving the preadamite system, or allowing a formation of new languages at Babel. A very learned man, who warmly espouses the notion of deducing all languages from one, is yet so sensible that exceptions must be made, that he himself excludes the languages

F

of

of America and of the Indian islands out of the Number ; adding, that some have thence rashly imagined, that the Men who speak those tongues are of a distinct species, and not the descendants of Adam: which concession is enough to overthrow the hypothesis he would maintain.

Some learned men however have endeavoured to derive all languages in general from the Hebrew, which they imagine to be the parent of all others. That they should succeed very well in finding a great conformity between that and the other oriental tongues is no wonder, since they are manifestly sprung from one common original; though it be difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the mother from the daughters. That they have also given tolerable satisfaction in deducing from the same tongue several words not only in the Greek and Latin, but in some other European languages, is not matter of such surprize, considering the great intercourse several nations of our continent had with the Phœnicians, whose mother tongue was the Hebrew. But when these Writers venture out of their depth, and pretend to deduce the more remote languages from the same fountain, they only shew their ignorance, and make themselves ridiculous to all who have but a moderate skill in those tongues; for a proof of which we could produce a multitude of examples from a celebrated and laborious work of that kind. As to the peculiar
ex-

excellencies found in the Hebrew tongue by some of its patrons, and which they imagine to be an additional proof of the justness of its pretensions, we may say something hereafter, when we come to give an account of this language.

Upon the whole, we think we may reasonably conclude, with a very learned person whose sentiments on this head we entirely approve, that upon the confusion of Babel there were new languages framed; whose languages have been the roots and originals from which the several dialects that are, or have been, or will be spoken as long as this earth shall last have arisen, and to which they may with ease be reduc'd.

In what manner these new languages were formed is a question hard to be determined; it seems by the Mosaical account, which is so solemn, and represents GOD as coming down in person to view the work of these builders, that it was the immediate act of GOD; and some have thence concluded, that he effected it by inducing an oblivion of their former tongue, and instantaneously infusing others in their minds, according to their several nations. The Jews imagine this was done by the ministry of Angels, seventy of whom descended with GOD, and were each of them set over a nation to which they taught a peculiar Language; but Israel fell to the lot of his own inheritance, the LORD's portion being his people, and therefore, they say, they retained the primitive tongue. Others have supposed, that GOD did

no more than cause them to forget their first language, leaving them to form new ones as they could; but this must have taken up some time, and could not answer the immediate occasions of mankind. As it would be to little purpose to enquire so curiously into this matter, as some have done, the best we can do is to conclude, that it was effected instantly, in a way and manner of which we can give no account.

It would be of as little use to collect the several opinions in relation to the number of languages formed at Babel: we may as well allow the number of seventy, just mentioned, as any other. We only know from Moses, that the Canaanitish or Hebrew, the Syriac and Egyptian languages were formed so soon as the time of Jacob. It is most probable that the languages of the chief families were fundamentally different from each other, and that the sub-languages or dialects within each branch, for the sake of immediate intercourse, had a mutual affinity, some more, some less, according as they settled near or farther from each other. And this was sufficient to bring about the designs of GOD to divide mankind into distinct societies, kingdoms, and commonwealths, and thereby to occasion the making of wholesome laws, the keeping of strict discipline, the encouragement of labour and industry of liberal arts, and all social virtues, and the suppression of such vices as weaken government and introduce a corruption of morals. All which opened a new scene

scene of providence, with a surprizing variety of wisdom, in the government of the world (e).

BEFORE I dismiss this Subject, I cannot but offer a Consideration or two in answer to what Mr. *Le Clerc* has observ'd on the word שפָּח *Sapha*. He would have the word interpreted *Agreement* or *Confederacy* not of *Language* (f); and then the 1st verse of *Genesis* Chap. 11, will run thus. *And the whole Earth was one Agreement, and of one Speech.* Now besides what Dr. *Wooton* has justly objected to this Interpretation, I cannot but think it very material, that the Verse concludes, *Udhebbharim Abadhim* וְדַבְּרִים אִחָדִים *and of one Speech.* Which to me is a manifest exposition of the foregoing words, or at least such a Restriction of them, as renders Mr. *Le Clerc's* interpretation of the word *Sapha* either improper or ineffectual. But a Passage a little lower seems to be a clear and indisputable confutation of it, in verse 7. *Let us go down and there confound their Language, that they may not understand one another's Speech.* These last words have a singular Weight and Authority in them, and serve not only to overthrow Mr. *Le Clerc*, but to establish also the general Opinion, that Confusion of Languages was really an Act of the Divine Power and Wrath. The *Hebrew* word which we translate *Speech* is *Sapha*, as in the beginning

(e) *Univerf Hist.* B. 1. C. 2, §. 5.

(f) *Clerc* in *Gen.* XI. 1. 7.

of this 7th and the 1st Verse. Now substitute in this place Mr. *Le Clerc's Agreement or Confederacy*, and then the Passage will run thus, *that they may not understand one anothers Confederacy*. Where is the Sense? Every one must see the evident necessity of interpreting *Sapba*, with *Vatablus*, *Drusius*, *Bochart*, *Grotius*, and others, *Lip* or *Language*. And if *Sapba* must necessarily have that Sense in the latter part of the Verse, it must also have the same Sense in the beginning both of this 7th and the 1st Verse, in order to preserve the just ἀπ' ὁμοιοῦς. This Argument, I confess, seems to me unanswerable, and perhaps its force may be favourably allow'd by so great a Professor of Reason and Critique as Mr. *Le Clerc*.

I WILL now conclude this Discourse with several very remarkable and considerable Testimonies neither *Jewish* nor *Christian* in favour of the *Mosaick* History of Babel. The first is from a Fragment of *Abydenus's* Assyrian History preserv'd in Eusebius (g).

There are some (says he) who relate, that the first of Mankind, rising out of the Earth, and elated exceedingly with their (prodigious)

(g) Præpar. Evang. Lib. 9. Cap. 14. Ἐν τῷ δ' οὗ λέγουσι τὰς πρώτας ἐκ γῆς ἀναχόντας, ῥώμῃ τε καὶ μεγέθει χαυνωθέντας, καὶ δὴ Θεῶν καταφρονητὰς ἀμείνονας εἶναι (πύργων) τύρσιν ἡλίεσσι ἀνίστασθαι, ἵνα νῦν βασιλῶν ἐσιν· ἡδὴ πᾶσιν εἶναι τὴν ἕραν· καὶ τὰς ἀνέμους δεξιῇ βωθιόντας (vel βοηθιόντας, Cyrillo εἰσδιόντας) ἀνατρέψαι πρὶ αὐτοῖσι τὸ μηχανήμα· τῷ δὲ ἔργῳ λέγουσιν Βαβυλῶνα. Τίως δὲ οἱ τὰς ἐμυγλάσους ἐκ Θεῶν πολύθρε (forte πολύτροον) φωνὴν ἐνείκαζον.

strength

strength and size, and thinking, to make themselves superiour even to the Gods themselves, rais'd a monstrous high Tower, and that they had almost got up to Heaven, when the Winds coming to the Assistance of the Gods, overturn'd their structure about them; and that having continued till that time of one and the same language, were thenceforward divided by the Gods into many. This passage of *Abydenus*, is quoted likewise by *Cyril*, in his first Book against *Julian* with very little Variation.

THE next is of the famous *Alexander*, call'd from his great Learning *Polyhistor*, who flourish'd in *Sylla's* time, about the 173^d Olympiad. He not only appears as an Evidence himself, but produces two others in Attestation of the same thing. Thus he speaks in *Eusebius* (b).

EUPOLEMUS in his *Treatise of the Jews* (the Latin Interpreter *Vigerus* is much mistaken in his Version of this Passage) says, that *Babylon* the City of *Assyria*, was first built by those who were sav'd from the Deluge; that they were Giants, and that they were the Persons that rais'd the Tower, so much celebrated in History. But that upon its being overthrown

(b) Ibid. Cap. 17. Εὐπόλεμος δὲ ἐν τῇ περὶ Ἰσραήλ, τῆς Ασσυρίας (not as in the Editions, Ἰσραήλ τῆς Ασσυρίας,) φησὶ πόλιν Βαβυλῶνα πρῶτον μὲν κτισθῆναι ὑπὸ διασωθέντων ἐκ τῆς κατακλυσμῆος αἱ αὐτὰς Γίγαντες οἰκοδομῆν ἢ τὸ ἰσχυρότερον πύργον. Πίστοντος ἢ τήτου ὑπὸ τῆς τῆς θεῆς ἐπιρροίας τοὺς Γίγαντας διασπαρῆναι καθ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν.

by the immediate Act of God the Giants were dispers'd over the whole Earth.

THE same Author in St. Cyril produces a Sibyl, delivering Her self to this effect (i).

THE Sibyl says, *That all Mankind being (for some time) of one Language, some of them built a prodigious Tower, in order to scale Heaven; But that God sending down his Winds upon the Tower, (totally) overthrew it and gave to every one a distinct Language; and that from thence the City was call'd Babylon.*

THE very words of the Sibyl are extant in Josephus's Antiquities (k).

THESE small but rare and valuable Fragments of Antiquity, how little soever they may seem to influence the Question in dispute, may at least, I hope, have the general Effect of all other antient History upon you and the Reader, in giving a sensible Pleasure to the Mind, and agreeable Entertainment to a Learned Curiosity.

(i) Lib. 1. cont. Julian. Σίβυλλα δὲ φησὶν, ὁμοφώνων ὄντων ἀπάντων τῶ ἀνθρώπων, πῶς τέτων πύργον ὑπερμεγέθη οἰκοδομήσαν, ὥπως εἰς τὸ ἕρανόν ἀναβῶσι, τοῦ ἧ Θεοῦ ἀνέμους πρὸς πύργον ἐμφυσησαντος, ἀνέτρεψαι αὐτὸν ἔϊδαν δαδία φωνὴν ἐκάστους· διὸ δὴ Βαβυλῶνα τὴν πόλιν κληθῆναι.

(k) Lib. 1. Cap. 4. Περὶ ἧ τοῦ πύργου τέτου, καὶ τῶ ἄλλοφωνίας τῶ ἀνθρώπων, μνησθῆναι ἔϊδον Σίβυλλα λέγουσα ἕτως· Πάντων ὁμοφώνων ὄντων τῶ ἀνθρώπων, πύργον ἀκοδομήσαν πῖνες ὑψηλόταται, ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ ἕρανόν ἀναβησάνθρωποι δι' αὐτοῦ· Οἱ ἧ Θεοὶ ἀνέμους ἐπιπέμψαντες, ἀνέτρεψαν τὸν πύργον, καὶ ἴδαν ἐκάστη φωνὴν ἑδῶκα.

Addend. p. 27.

[ANY more than the Head of *Nile*.] This Phrase I had used proverbially, following the Language still current amongst us; but I would not contend for the Justness or Propriety of it, since whatever Exceptions or Doubts have been started against the *Portuguese* or *Ludolphus's* Accounts of the *Nile*, as rising in Mount *Dengla* in *Goiama*, I esteem the Evidence from them concerning the true Source of that River, to be so great and satisfactory, that we may justly acquiesce in it, as really indisputable.